

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stark (U.S. Pat. Application Publication No. 2002/0186312) (hereinafter “Stark”) in view of Trevino (U.S. Patent No. 6,856,349) (hereinafter “Trevino”) in view of Tay (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0193594) (hereinafter “Tay”) and further in view of the Japanese Publication to Ogata (Japanese Publication No.: H03-027684) (hereinafter “Ogata”).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have newly-amended independent claim 1 to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application. Accordingly, claims 1-5 remain currently pending and under consideration.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stark in view of Trevino in view of Tay and further in view of Ogata. Applicants have newly-amended independent claim 1 to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application. To the extent that these rejections might be deemed to still apply to the claims as newly-amended, they are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s indication in the “Response to Arguments” section of the Office Action dated June 18, 2010 with regard to a length of a row selecting signal line, is technically incorrect. More particularly, Applicants respectfully submit

that the length relationship between the row selecting signal line and the gate signal line is particularly important for at least the following reasons. Applicants note that the object of the instant application's claimed invention is not to shorten a length of a row selecting signal line, but is instead to compensate for waveform deterioration on a row selecting signal line.

Applicants respectfully submit that, for such compensation, the invention claimed in the instant application comprises a waveform shaping means and utilizes a gate signal. The waveform deterioration of the gate signal can be suppressed compared with that of the associated row selecting signal because the gate signal line has a shorter length than the associated row selecting signal line. In other words, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention inputs the gate signal into the waveform shaping means by the shorter gate signal line which is distinguished from the associated longer row selecting signal line.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that in the advantageous combination of features of newly-amended independent claim 1 of the instant application, the inclusion of and the position of two measurement points defining the gate signal line are defined. Even further, the inclusion of and the position of two measurement points defining the associated row selecting signal line are defined. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, whether taken separately or in combination, do not teach or suggest a length relationship between such lines in the manner specifically recited in newly-amended independent claim 1 of the instant application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because none of the above listed references, whether taken separately or combined, teach or suggest each feature of newly-amended independent claim 1 of the instant application. As pointed out by MPEP § 2143.03, "[a]ll words in a claim must be considered in

judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.’ In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970).” Since the prior art does not disclose or suggest any of the combinations recited in Applicants’ claims, and if anything appears to teach away from the current claim recitations, KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 127 S.Ct. 1727 (2007), Applicants submit that such recited combinations would not have been obvious in view of the applied references of record, whether taken alone or combined in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that the dependent claims 2-5 are allowable at least because of their dependence from independent claim 1, and the reasons discussed previously.

In view of the above-described amendments and remarks, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicants believe no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0573, under Order No. 046884-5501-00-US-229377 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: December 14, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Paul A. Fournier
Registration No.: 41,023
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
1500 K Street N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-1209
(202) 842-8812
(202) 842-8465 (Fax)
Attorney For Applicants